

**COMMITTEE ON WATER AND SANITATION**  
(Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council)

**Chairman:** Mr. Timothy J. Callanan, Council District No. 2

A special **meeting** of the **COMMITTEE ON WATER AND SANITATION**, Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council was held on **Monday April 26, 2010**, at **6:00 p.m.**, in the Assembly Room, Berkeley County Administration Building, 1003 Highway 52, Moncks Corner, South Carolina at 6:09 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Timothy J. Callanan, Council District No. 2; Committee Member Phillip Farley, Council District No. 1; Committee Member Robert O. Call, Jr., Council District No. 3; Committee Member Cathy Davis, Council District No. 4; Committee Member. Dennis L. Fish, Council District No. 5; Committee Member Jack H. Schurlknight, Council District No. 6; Committee Member Caldwell Pinckney, Jr., Council District No. 7; Committee Member Steve C. Davis, Council District No. 8; Supervisor Daniel W. Davis, Supervisor, ex officio; Ms. Nicole Scott Ewing, County Attorney; and Ms. Barbara B. Austin, Clerk of County Council.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, the electronic and print media were duly notified.

Chairman Callanan called the special meeting to order. Mr. Colin Martin provided the Invocation and Committee Member S. Davis led in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

**A. Mr. Micah Miley, Director of Engineering, Berkeley County Water and Sanitation,**  
Re: Central Berkeley Waste Water Treatment Plant increase in budget.

Mr. Miley: Good evening, Council. At the last meeting a question was asked regarding the site location valuation that was done between the two different sites. In your package you've been provided with a update to the report that was a part of the Master Plan. We went back through the report from cover to cover. A few numbers adjusted and changed over time but the final result was still the same, that the landfill property was the most beneficial property to locate the plant. And with that I'll answer any additional questions you may have.

Committee Member S. Davis: First of all I want to thank the Chairman and the people at Water and Sanitation for providing us with this updated evaluation. For some reason my name has been very pronounced in the Berkeley Country Club and I'm not too much concerned about that if we are designated doing what's right and proper and I will share at this time that having reviewed the evaluation and some things stand out about site location, talks about ease of access so I think that's great. I want the citizens of Berkeley Country Club to be fully aware that I support the relocation. I don't want to make this no political issue, that's not what it should be about. What I was more concerned about primarily if it was the most feasible site from a financial standpoint and having said that I'll yield the floor back at this time.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. The question I had on this was, and I mentioned it to you – the surprising thing I think for me was the fact that when you include all the necessary pump stations in this project it turns to a \$40 million project versus a \$20 million project. Now, I know all those don't have to be built today.....

Mr. Miley: And many of those are not gonna be built today. You're looking at the 25-year Master Plan of how the site would develop. Many of these stations will be added on as the developers develop property out in the outlying portions of the county and the service area as well.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. Which of these pump stations A-G are going to be built with the construction of the new plant?

Mr. Miley: Pump Station E; the upgrade of Pump Station 105; and Pump Station ... the pumps for the existing Wastewater Treatment Plant, down at the bottom.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. And so all of the other ones we don't have, we're not going to build presently, however, are any of them in the finance through the existing bond?

Mr. Miley: The stations I listed are the total ones that are in the current bond project as we have it set up today. Pump Station E diverts sewer from what is existing Cane Bay; the pumps for the existing Wastewater Treatment Plant turns around the flow that is at the Country Club property; and upgrade of Pump Station 105 is what picks up the existing flow and the flow from Country Club is just turned around to move it to the new plant.

Chairman Callanan: Anyway, why does it show the construction of the Wastewater Treatment Plant as \$27 million?

Mr. Miley: These were based on numbers when we were going through the planning process of what it was expected to cost as far as construction. We did not go through and update all of the construction cost estimates for each one of the individual pieces when we were looking at the evaluation of the two sites. The numbers would change for - the numbers for each of the sites would change proportionally based on current construction costs so still, the comparison of site-to-site is accurate based on the cost estimates from a few years ago.

Chairman Callanan: So what's the total construction costs as of today when you include in all engineering cause in the bond we put a – we said \$20 million, right? And when was this original report done?

Mr. Miley: 96. I'm sorry, 06.

Chairman Callanan: Okay, so after the bond?

Mr. Miley: Yes.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. And so what's our total construction costs now?

Mr. Miley: The total plant construction cost is \$18,744. Engineering coupled with that comes up to \$20,300,000. The construction of turning around the Pump Station E and upgrading 105 and 94 have not been bid yet.

Chairman Callanan: So this is \$7 million off?

Mr. Miley: Under. Yes.

Chairman Callanan: Under? I mean – we’re – I mean, that’s obviously substantially off. And the, and so there is a three and a half million dollar cost difference but the way that I read this when you take into account, I guess, the value of the existing equipment at the depreciated value at the existing equipment at the plant it brings it down to only a \$1 million kind of premium for moving it to the landfill?

Mr. Miley: I think the numbers actually add up to around the \$2 million mark. And I don’t have those summed up separately in front of me right here.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. And, how much land at the landfill site is this going to encompass when you include buffers and everything else in there?

Mr. Miley: David Hunt, our Project Manager for the site, is with us today and I honestly did not look at that little chunk [if you’d pull the acreage]. One of the key points to looking at the landfill property – the portion where we’re putting the Wastewater Treatment Plant sticks off from the rest of the property and based on landfill required set-backs off of landfill when you’re using it for landfill, it’s unusable property because you can’t set-back off on it, so it’s a strip that can’t be used for landfill which is another thing that we .....

Chairman Callanan: Right, that’s kind of where I was going, so .....

Mr. Miley: I wish I could answer acreage but I can’t answer that to you.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. So are there any questions on this?

Committee Member C. Davis: Yes, I’ve got a question for Micah. I seem to remember something from several years ago concerning a flow diversion for the Central Berkeley Treatment Plant. Didn’t we do a .....

Mr. Miley: We did two different small projects associated with that. One was to divert the flow away from the Oakley Point Subdivision as it was being constructed; that was done at developer expense. And the second was to actually route our new Administration Building to the Central Berkeley Plant which was at one time titled “A Diversion of Flow for Central Berkeley” or had the words tied in to the project name. We had evaluated moving Moss Grove down to Lower Berkeley probably 10 years ago but the costs associated with that were outside of what could be done there, and the flow from the landfill we are still looking at which way is most

effective to treat it. It's right on the borderline of whether it would go to Central in the future or stay with Lower.

Committee Member C. Davis: Okay. I've got one more question. What could or will be done is your plan for the – if this were to move the old site?

Mr. Miley: Right now Water and Sanitation has no plans exactly what to do with the property. There is quite a bit of the property as a whole that is wetlands. There's also quite a bit of easements that are gonna be coming across with effluent lines going to the river as well as wastewater leaving the subdivision and going back toward the new site. Our survey – the company that does the survey work for us now is finalizing all of the numbers to give you actual high acreage that is going to be unencumbered and they did not have that document ready for me to bring tonight so I don't have that with me tonight. I would imagine that you're looking at something like a 45-50 acre total property. With that you're gonna see about 40% unencumbered from wetlands or easements that would be available for County to sell or develop in some way.

Committee Member C. Davis: Wouldn't there be some type of clean-up process that we would have to do before that happens?

Mr. Miley: The existing treatment plant itself will have to be – basically, it's a large pond for lack of a better term – it's just a lagoon that's used for aerating the waste. All of the existing waste that is in there, the sludge and the liquid, would have to be removed and then backfilled. It is a lined lagoon so once you remove the liner the environmental [inaudible] cleaned up.

Committee Member C. Davis: Okay. Thank you.

Committee Member Farley: Micah, on that 1,000 foot buffer – isn't it 1,000 foot on the.....

Mr. Miley: It is – on the landfill property [inaudible]

Committee Member Farley: Can that be 1,000 foot from Water and Sanitation now or would that have to be – could the Plant be closer to, since it would all be under Water and Sanitation?

Mr. Miley: The Plant can be inside of the 1,000 foot buffer. The reference I was making about the property – it kind of sticks off like a peninsula, let's just say Florida, and if you put 1,000 feet from each bound on that, there's nothing left in the center to build a landfill.

Committee Member Farley: Right. Okay.

Chairman Callanan: Did you have a map that – or were you gonna – was it a miscommunication here? I thought we were gonna have individual maps for everyone.

Mr. Miley: It was a printer problem with me and it backfired on me and I didn't get 'em produced today, so I apologize for that. I do have one copy here I can pass down showing the [inaudible].

Chairman Callanan: Well, I mean, and – here's my take on this – it's just, it's the largest project that we're ever going to take down for Water and Sanitation so I just want to make sure every person on this Council understands in detail what's involved in it. I mean, it's \$40 million of \$105 million bond and so that's, you know, part of the reason I wanted that map. I just – it – so there's no question here. Is there any other questions?

Committee Member Fish: One of my concerns is that, you know ....

Chairman Callanan: Hold on, let Micah get back up here. Okay.

Mr. Miley: Sorry [inaudible]

Committee Member Fish: A couple concerns on there. Number one, we talked quite a few years back ... my understanding is that all the area around the Cane Bay area, parts of the Berkeley area, was gonna be a gravity flow to Lower Berkeley. And then now all of a sudden – not all of a sudden – but this change now to where we're moving it to the Central Berkeley using pump stations. With the cost involved that's substantial. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we hold this off until we get a workshop with those maps sometime in the next couple months to see – I agree with you, that's a lot of money – I don't think it's gonna hurt us to delay for two more months to find out what the real impact is.

Mr. Miley: Well, let me clarify that a little bit. The parts of Berkeley and the Carnes Crossing, those two developments, are still coming to Lower Berkeley as they've always been planned. Cane Bay is the property that is turning. When you go back to Master Planning of 10-12 years ago, there was one trunk that was looked at to carry more flow than what it can actually carry. There is a gravity line way down in the system nearing the Crowfield area that is the bottleneck for all of that level of flow coming from that direction. What this project does is allow that gravity trunk going toward Lower Berkeley to properly serve Carnes and Parks as much as gravity as can be served by gravity, and then the flow from the development of Cane Bay and its sister project, the Pine Hill tract, would come over by force main which is currently going to Lower Berkeley by force main. The only diversion that would happen is from Pump Station 150 which is the large station serving Cane Bay now, a new force main would be laid for it back toward Pump Station E which would develop the sewer in to Central Berkeley. The force main that is in the ground today that Pump Station 150 uses would be utilized by Parks to serve the upper portion of the Parks.

Committee Member Fish: Cause also there's a lot of people in that area – how we gonna serve them because they cannot get in to that system now because it's pressurized. We just abandon those people or how you – what's your – how does this tie into that?

Mr. Miley: On this, the Pump Station F that's shown on the map that's being produced for you now is actually located a little bit further down 17-A as a future Master Plan Station that would serve the area that you're talking about that is north and west of Carnes Crossing.

Committee Member Fish: When is that proposed to be and where's the funding coming for it?

Mr. Miley: That is not in any funding source at this time.

Committee Member Fish: And also when you mention that the cost difference is about - \$7 million that's unfunded. What's your proposal for funding on that to complete this project?

Mr. Miley: \$7 million that's unfunded? I'm sorry, where you came from that?

Committee Member Fish: The bond was for \$20 million. We're talking about \$39 million total. Where's the difference in funding coming from?

Mr. Miley: The \$39 million you're talking about there is a Master Plan of 25 years. All of the projects that are in that \$39 million are not what is being constructed today. The projects that we are looking at doing – which is the stations I mentioned: E; 105 upgrade; the Pump Station at the existing Berkeley site – are in the two bond projects, the Central Berkeley Diversion and the Central Berkeley Treatment Plant funding, which is a total of \$29 million today.

Committee Member Fish: And we've got funding for \$20 million?

Mr. Miley: We have \$29 – well, you have.....

Committee Member Fish: If we approve this increase, you have \$29.

Mr. Miley: With the approved increase. Yes, sir.

Committee Member Fish: But there again, where's that additional money coming from?

Mr. Miley: That's in the future 25-year build out of the project. Much of these additions would be developer driven stations built by developers as they develop the property.

Committee Member Fish: No, I'm talking about the money – our shortfall right today. You're requesting an additional \$3 million.....

Mr. Miley: \$1.6 million today, there's \$3 million uncommitted funds in bond proceeds today. The \$1.76 million increase would come from the \$3.15 uncommitted funds today.

Committee Member Fish: Do we have those funds?

Mr. Miley: Yes, sir.

Committee Member Fish: Thank you.

Chairman Callanan: So on all of this map, with the exception of the ones that you're listing, we don't need to do any of these now? What if development goes in to these areas?

Mr. Miley: Development would drive those stations going in to those areas.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. Is there any further questions on this?

Committee Member Farley: Are we gonna put it off a month and get a .....

Chairman Callanan: Well, if you all – the recommendation was from Mr. Fish regarding a workshop explaining this in its totality. It's, I mean, whatever your pleasure.

Committee Member C. Davis: I second that motion.

Mr. Miley: One more thing here to consider. We would have to rebid this project. Steel prices have been going up and I would expect the rebid of this project to increase but if.....

Chairman Callanan: How long are the bids good for?

Mr. Miley: The bids were good for 90-days and they are good essentially till now. By the time we went through the bids, everything in the budget adjustment, we are out of the 90-day window on the bids.

Committee Member Fish: I just don't like being blackmailed because of that potential – we went through that before with some other pipe that turned out it wasn't the case.

Committee Member Call: I move that we go ahead and approve this. I hope I'm right. I think Mr. Fish has a motion out there without a second.

Chairman Callanan: No, we had a second.

Committee Member C. Davis: I seconded it.

Committee Member Call: It does have a second? I'm sorry.

Chairman Callanan: I mean, it's –

Committee Member Schurlnknight: What else do we need to know about this to hold it off and take a chance at having to rebid this is probably – Micah, how much time we got left?

Mr. Miley: Before the bids expire?

Committee Member Schurlnknight: Yeah.

Mr. Miley: They expire tomorrow.

Committee Member Schurlknight: They expire tomorrow. The bids expire – if we can, we got the map here in front of us – as you will see in – Micah said we got \$3 million in the bond money that's not committed.....

Chairman Callanan: Okay, um...

Supervisor Davis: I'm gonna have to ask Council to very seriously consider delayin' this project because of the, because the project has already been bid. You know, this project again as I said last meeting was conceived and initiated long before many of us got here but this has been in the process for several years now. It has been the subject of updates by Water and Sanitation at budget time and they have been proceeding thinking that Council was well informed of what the process was, what the plan was and to stop now may just put the bids in jeopardy. The contractor's now know what the lowest price is and those that left money on the table may not – or underbid the project – may not do, may not repeat that, so we do run the risk of a higher bid.

Committee Member C. Davis: But Mr. Davis isn't that kind of the last minute to wait – we didn't hear anything about this until 2 weeks ago.

Supervisor Davis: No m'am, I don't agree with this. We've – again, it was a part of the.....

Committee Member C. Davis: I mean, it hasn't been brought before us until 2 weeks ago, for vote.

Supervisor Davis: You're answering your own question. I'll just.....

Chairman Callanan: Okay, with that, I have a motion and a second to hold this for, what, until we perform a workshop?

Committee Member Fish: I'd say time to get a workshop together whether it be 2 weeks, 4 weeks.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. Is there any further discussion on that?

Committee Member S. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just before we vote I want no doubt in relationship to where I stand. I like to play fair and I mean in this regard I requested and it was seconded by Tim Callanan to get this updated evaluation which I've had the pleasure of taking my time in reading and.....

Chairman Callanan: I don't think it was seconded by me cause I was Chairman of the Committee.

Committee Member S. Davis: Well it really don't matter. The bottom line is they have provided the information that I basically think we needed and I just hate to think that we gotta



bounce this further down the road when it's been the plannin' stage for some period of time. My grave concern was whether they could support the position that the Central waste site was the best site having read the information then I must accept the information has been submitted especially since we were travelin' down this yellow brick road for some period of time. I see no reason now at this particular point to delay. I just don't want no false perception. I'm with Mr. Call in reference to his motion if this motion fails to move forward to let Water and Sanitation go about the business of creatin' this new wastewater site at the new location.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. So, let's tackle that one when it happens.

Committee Member S. Davis: Fair enough.

Committee Member Call: Mr. Chairman, if I may, under discussion we run the risk that the low bidders price is out there and he probably, he may elect to not bid again because the low price is out there. Additionally, I just basin' my opinion on what I read in the paper, what I hear from the people in my industry, costs are goin' up and whether this will effect this, I don't know, but I think we would be takin' a pretty big risk to let these bids expire. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Callanan: Okay. Is there any further discussion on that?

It was moved by Committee Member Fish and seconded by Committee Member C. Davis to **deny** the Central Berkeley Waste Water Treatment Plant increase in budget until such time that a workshop could first be held. The motion **failed** by voice vote of the Committee. Committee Member Call, Committee Member Pinckney, Committee Member Schurlknight, and Committee Member S. Davis voted, "Nay".

Supervisor Davis: Nay. You gonna call for a vote? Tie breaker?

Chairman Callanan: What? There is no tie breaker.

Committee Member Call: It was 5 ...

Chairman Callanan: And quite frankly if it was a tie breaker it would go to the Chairman anyway. [laughter]

[inaudible]: Good try, Dan.

[inaudible]: Good try.

Supervisor Davis: Just wanted to express my opinion.

Chairman Callanan: Well thank you, Mr. Davis. It's noted.

It was moved by Committee Member Call and seconded by Committee Member Schurlknight to **approve** the Central Berkeley Waste Water Treatment Plant increase in budget.

April 26, 2010

The motion passed by voice vote of the Committee. Committee Member Farley, Committee Member Fish, and Committee Member C. Davis voted, "Nay".

It was moved by Committee Member S. Davis and seconded by Committee Member C. Davis to **adjourn** the Committee on Water and Sanitation special meeting. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

The meeting ended at 6:37 p.m.

11 May 2010  
Date Approved

**COMMITTEE ON WATER AND SANITATION**

(Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council)

Chairman: Mr. Timothy J. Callanan, District No. 2

Members: Mr. Phillip Farley, District No. 1  
Mr. Robert O. Call, Jr., District No. 3  
Mrs. Cathy Davis, District No. 4  
Mr. Dennis L. Fish, District No. 5  
Mr. Jack H. Schurlknight, District No. 6  
Mr. Caldwell Pinckney, Jr., District No. 7  
Mr. Steve C. Davis, District No. 8  
Mr. Daniel W. Davis, Supervisor, ex officio

A special **meeting** of the **COMMITTEE ON WATER AND SANITATION**, Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council will be held on **Monday April 26, 2010**, at **6:00 p.m.**, in the Assembly Room, Berkeley County Administration Building, 1003 Highway 52, Moncks Corner, South Carolina.

**AGENDA**

**INVOCATION**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**A. Mr. Micah Miley, Director of Engineering, Berkeley County Water and Sanitation,**  
Re: Central Berkeley Waste Water Treatment Plant increase in budget.

April 21, 2010  
S/Barbara B. Austin, CCC  
Clerk of County Council